UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,625	10/23/2003	Michel Therin	114138	5931
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 02/22/201 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	350	TYSON, MELANIE RUANO		
ALEAANDRIA	A, VA 22320-4850		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3773	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)	
THERIN ET AL.	
Art Unit	
3773	
	THERIN ET AL.  Art Unit

	MELANIE TYSON	3773	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS .	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavireal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT »);	ΓE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d)⊠ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	acted claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)		cied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / unonamone (i	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-6,8-11 and 14-18</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>19-23</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	1 6 0 1 1 6 6 C 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/	MALLE STEEL TO		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773	/Melanie Tyson/ Examiner, Art Unit 3773		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: New claim 24 raises new issues that would require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Schmitt fails to disclose or teach portions of the macroporous texture being occluded. However, Schmitt teaches the sizes of the macropores may be modified with a resin. Since the applicant has not disclosed any benefit of occluding portions of the macroporous texture, it is the examiner's position that such a modification would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art as a matter of design choice. If the applicant submits that the embodiments are not obvious variations, it is noted that the claims would be withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. The applicant received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention of the embodiment in which the macroporous texture is preserved, or not occluded, this invention being constructively elected by original prosecution on the merits.